

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, D.C.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
SEPTEMBER 13, 2013 IN THE STATE ROOM

Present: President Knapp, Provost Lerman, Registrar Amundson, and Parliamentary Charnovitz; Deans Dolling, Feuer, Goldman, and Johnson; Professors Acquaviva, Brand, Brazinsky, Briscoe, Castleberry, Costello, Downes, Dickinson, Fairfax, Galston, Garriss, Harrington, Hawley, Helgert, Katz, Lantz, Lindahl, Marotta-Walters, McAleavey, McDonnell, Miller, Newcomer, Parsons, Price, Pulcini, Rehman, Roddis, Shesser, Sidawy, Simon, Srinivas, Swaine, Weiner, and Yezer

Absent: Deans Akman, Brown, Eskandarian, and Interim Deans Kaye and Maggs; Professors Cordes, Jacobson, Stott, Swiercz, and Williams

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2: 18 p.m.

IN MEMORIAM

Professor William Briscoe read the tribute to Professor Otto Bergmann, Professor Emeritus of Physics. The tribute is included with these minutes.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on May 10, 2013 were approved as distributed.

INTRODUCTION OF NEWLY-ELECTED AND RE-ELECTED FACULTY MEMBERS

For the benefit of those not present at the May Senate meeting, President Knapp repeated the introduction of these faculty members, the Parliamentarian, and members of the 2013-14 Senate Executive Committee.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AND OTHER GUESTS

President Knapp began by introducing the Chair of the GW Board of Trustees, Nelson A. Carbonell, Jr., and the President of the GW Student Association, Julia Susuni. The President said he thought that there were also a number of other guests present, but that he wanted in particular to mention Professor Murli Gupta. who has not only served as an elected Senate member, but has continued his contributions to the work of the Faculty Senate by serving ably and faithfully for a number of years as Chair of the Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies (including Fringe Benefits). The President thanked Professor Gupta for his attendance at the meeting.

President Knapp noted that earlier this year, the appointment of new leaders in a number of key areas was announced. A number of them present at the Senate meeting were introduced, as follows:

Laurie Koehler, senior associate provost for Enrollment Management, who comes to GW from Bryn Mawr College, where she served as interim dean of enrollment and dean of admissions

Geneva Henry, university librarian and vice provost for Libraries, who joined GW after serving as executive director of digital scholarship services at Rice University

Rene Stewart O'Neal, vice provost for Budget and Finance, who served as director of planning and assistant director of the Office of Planning and Budgets at Michigan State University

Ann McCorvey, deputy executive vice president and treasurer, who joined GW from Eastman Kodak, where she served as chief financial officer and senior vice president.

President Knapp noted that Ben Vinson, the newly appointed Dean of the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, could not be present at the meeting. Dean Vinson comes to GW from Johns Hopkins University where he served as Vice Dean for Centers and Interdisciplinary Programs for Graduate Education. He is an expert in Latin American history and has also held faculty positions at Penn State and Barnard College.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

RESPONSE OF THE ADMINISTRATION TO SENATE RESOLUTIONS FOR THE 2012-13 SESSION

The Administration's response to 2012-13 session resolutions was distributed with the meeting agenda. There were no questions or comments concerning these.

REMARKS BY NELSON A. CARBONELL, JR., CHAIR, BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Mr. Carbonell thanked the Senate for the invitation to the meeting, and added it was a really great pleasure for him as the new Board Chair to address the group. He began by saying that as he has told the Board, the University's faculty is the reason the Board can accomplish anything at the institution. So the faculty is something that should be cherished and nurtured. Mr. Carbonell said that the Board is very enthusiastic at the prospect of working with the faculty, and that he had encouraged Board members to reach out to faculty leaders, as well as faculty anywhere in the institution in order to accomplish this.

Mr. Carbonell then spoke about resolutions and actions taken by the Board of Trustees at its meeting in May, 2013, and began by providing a little history. He related that ten years ago the Board reviewed its bylaws and made modifications to them. At that time,

the Board also adopted a new Strategic Plan [for Academic Excellence] for the University. Also in 2003, the *Faculty Code* was reviewed by the Board and that *Code* was adopted in the year 2003. More recently, in 2013 the University engaged in a broad process led by Provost Lerman to develop a new Strategic Plan. This Plan was enthusiastically approved by the Board in May of 2013. In light of the Plan, the Board reviewed its Bylaws and made changes to these. Outgoing Board Chairman Ramsey put forward a resolution, which was adopted by the Board, that charged the Board of Trustees under the new Board Chair with reviewing the *Faculty Code* and recommending changes if necessary.

As background to his further remarks, Chair Carbonell said he had been at the University beginning in 1981 when he was a student, and more recently as a member of the Board of Trustees for over a decade. He added that he cherishes the institution and thinks the University has some really wonderful things ahead of it. One of his most satisfying experiences as a Board member was to serve on the Search Committee that selected President Knapp. He noted that some of the Senators at the meeting were on this Search Committee as well.

The Search Committee had a challenge in that it had 15 members and probably about 150,000 other people who cared a great deal about who GW's next president would be. The search process required confidentiality and absolute secrecy about who the candidates were. The dilemma was how to find a way to keep the University's constituencies engaged in the process when the process was going to be completely secret. The solution was to break the process into two parts. Chair Carbonell said he led a process where the Search Committee conducted a series of town hall meetings. The Committee met with alumni, the faculty, students, Foggy Bottom neighbors, D.C. City Council members and the Mayor, as well as with everyone else the Committee thought might have an interest in who the next GW president might be. Two questions were posed at these meetings: what the University should aspire to as an institution, and what should be the characteristics of the next President. The answers to those questions were given by the search consultant to Steven Knapp, who then decided he wanted to be considered as a candidate. The search process proceeded, and Dr. Knapp was selected.

Chair Carbonell said he thought this had been a terrific process. Learning from that, the process of considering revisions to the *Faculty Code* should be the formation of a Task Force made up of Board members and a broad section of the faculty, as many of those who would engage with the Task Force, to talk about the University's aspirations. In addition, the Task Force should find out what the things are about GW and the way it governs itself that they like, what works well, and what things need to be changed. This first phase, which Chair Carbonell likened to a listening tour, would gather a large cross-section of what the faculty believes is needed for the University to move ahead and meet its goals as an institution. As most know, GW aspires to be one of the premier institutions of higher education globally, and that is not a subject for debate, as that has been a goal for some time and has served the institution well. Chair Carbonell said the Task Force would likely find a variety of opinions and a variety of problems in need of a solution, some of which might contradict one another and some of which might achieve some broad consensus. At the end of this phase, the Task Force would make recommendations to the Board about any areas that it thought needed revision.

Chair Carbonell then commented upon his own goals for the University's governance model, i.e., the Bylaws of the institution, the Strategic Plan which guides the Administration, and the *Code* which governs the University's faculty. These goals would be to see that all of these 1) are the best that they can possibly be, and 2) be in alignment with one another. So for example, if there are goals the University aspires to in the Plan, the Board needs to make sure that the other parts of the governance model are in line with these, and there will not be things that are going to block the University from achieving the goals in its strategy. The Task Force will look for possible revisions to things that are outdated in the *Code* and also take a look at best practices.

Recommendations of the Task Force will go forward to the Board, and it will engage in a process of looking at the revisions that make sense. There will be ample time to review and obtain feedback on these. The plan is that in May of 2014, the Board will approve a revised *Faculty Code* and implementation will take place during the 2014-15 academic year. The timeline is important, but what is just as significant is talking to and interacting with a large variety of faculty.

Chair Carbonell then described the way in which the process would unfold. He said he had already met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and was following that up by attending and addressing the Senate at its first meeting of the 2013-14 academic year. On October 1st, he said he would address the Faculty Assembly with broader comments, some on this topic, and others on things the Board would like the University to focus on and aspects of the Strategic Plan. In October, the Task Force will begin its meetings with faculty, however they want to assemble themselves, for example, departments and Committees that do particular work – whoever it makes sense for the Task Force to talk with. Hopefully, in December or January, the recommendations of the Task Force will be complete and ready to go forward.

Chair Carbonell concluded his remarks by saying he wanted to answer a question that is frequently posed to him, and that is what he wants. He said he had never read the *Faculty Code*, and to be honest, he was not the one who should decide what he thought the *Faculty Code* should say. He added that his objective is to get the best possible *Code* that the University needs to move forward with its strategy.

Discussion followed. Professor Garris said it seemed to him that the Chair did not understand what the *Faculty Code* is. It is not merely the document that governs the faculty, as the Chair noted, but is basically a contractual agreement between the University and the faculty that sets forth the role of the faculty in the governance of the University.

Professor Garris then briefly described a landmark court case involving Yeshiva University which said that faculty members have a right to unionize if they are not management employees. In view of this decision, a lot of universities looked at this question and tried to decide whether faculty are management or not. GW at some point made the decision that faculty are managers. Administrators are temporary people that come to the institution for perhaps 5 or 10 years, sometimes more, but for the most part for a limited time. These administrators serve to oversee the operations of the University, but the management of academic programs has always rested with the faculty. The balance

between unionization and this key aspect of the faculty's role in University governance is a cornerstone of the *Faculty Code*.

Professor Garris said he thought if one reads the *Faculty Code* they would find it to be a living document. It is not something that was revised in 2003 and has remained unchanged since then, which might indicate that a revision is due or overdue ten years later. That is not how the *Faculty Code* was set up. The *Code* has been revised numerous times since its 9th printing in 2004. When it is republished it incorporates all of the changes that have been made since the last edition, and it is reviewed thoroughly by many people to ensure that everything in it is up to date and accurate. The *Faculty Code* is far older than 2003. The revision process is incremental; the faculty, the administration, and the Board agree upon changes and the *Faculty Code* evolves, sometimes from year to year. Changes typically are implemented as they are approved by the Board.

Professor Garris said that he has been at GW, and on the Senate, for quite a long time and that he is the current Chair of the Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom. This group is charged with reviewing and making recommendations for Senate action on changes to the *Faculty Code*. Over a very long time, the Committee has been open to changes in the *Code*, and many changes have been made. Professor Garris said he thought there is a lot of history and a lot of wisdom engrained in the *Code*, and that it requires hard work to understand it fully. Professor Garris added that he was very skeptical about the approach to *Code* revision described by the Chair, and cautioned that great care should be employed in any such undertaking, rather than having a Task Force come along cherry-picking certain things that people dislike and then devising within a few months a *Code* revision for the Board to implement quickly.

Chair Carbonell said that this sort of feedback would be useful as the process unfolds. The process itself does not have an objective to do any of the things described, i.e., cherry-picking or wholesale *Code* revision. The Chair also said he would hesitate to say that his own ignorance of the *Code* disqualifies him to run a process where Board members talk to the faculty about what they want. The Board would like to make sure that it has looked at the *Code* and that it is in alignment with what the University is trying to do as an institution; that is the objective. The Board needs to know from the faculty what those things are that should change, and what those things are that don't need to change. The Board needs to have a relationship with the faculty, and that relationship is implemented through the *Code*. The Task Force will provide the opportunity for Board members to engage with the faculty. The Board will not be formulating *Code* revisions in a retreat; rather, Board members will talk to the faculty.

Professor Parsons noted that the faculty has to approve changes to the *Faculty Code* and that these must be approved by the Senate, so he recommended that the Chair might note this on any future schematic for the *Code* revision process. He added that it would be an enormous undertaking to review the *Code* if it is to be done from the ground up as described, particularly since the Senate can spend two or three meetings (as happened in 2012-13 and previous years) considering and amending a single portion of the *Code*.

Chair Carbonell again expressed appreciation for this feedback, and said he wanted to reiterate that the first phase of this process is to obtain an understanding of where

changes are necessary to serve the needs of the institution, and then engage in a process that allows the Board to make sure those changes are made.

Professor Yezer said he believed that resolutions proposing changes to the *Faculty Code* always come through the PEAFF Committee before they are considered by the Senate as a whole. Many present expressed agreement with this observation. If the process of examining the need for revisions to the *Faculty Code* goes through the PEAFF Committee as usual, that Committee's membership is certain to grow, and in this way a group of faculty may be assembled that will take the time to give the careful consideration to proposed changes that the Code deserves. Many parts of the Code interact with and depend upon each other, so this traditional process of considering revisions to the Code is one that has stood the test of time.

Professor Castleberry said he wanted to react to the Chair's statement of hope that in May of 2014 the Board would in effect have gathered enough information to come to a vote approving a revised Code. Echoing what Professors Parsons and Yezer had said, he noted that the faculty members assembled in the State Room are the elected representatives of faculty members in each of the schools of University. The Senate guards its prerogatives assiduously, and it would be highly irregular if revisions to the Code were made with faculty input that did not include review of that input and proposed revisions to the Code by the PEAFF Committee. Professor Castleberry said he thought that if the Board voted upon such changes and hardened in stone a Board position that should come out of a collaborative agreement with the organized faculty leadership of the Senate, this would run the risk of creating an adversarial situation caused by the way in which the process was set up.

Chair Carbonell responded that there is no intention of creating an adversarial process. However, the Board needs to reach out on a broad basis to the faculty to make sure it gets all of the inputs about what everybody would like. He added that he thought this process has worked well for the University in the past on a number of strategic things, and at this point there are no specific items on a list for Code revision. Once the Board understands what the specific items are, it can map out the process to be followed from there on. Depending upon the feedback obtained, if changes to the Code are relatively minor (he said he did not know if they are or aren't) different steps in the process may be required. The University is not at the stage where it is drafting legal language, or considering the appropriate approval route for suggested revisions. The intent is not to create some battle between the Board and the faculty. It is up to the Board to facilitate a process to make sure that the way that faculty governance is set up aligns with the institution's needs; that is the Board's prerogative, as it has a duty of care as steward of the institution. It needs to ensure alignment between the Board's Bylaws, the Strategic Plan, and the *Faculty Code*, as mentioned before. The Board is at the stage where it is talking about really understanding, on a broad basis, what the faculty needs in order to be successful at achieving the goals the University has adopted collectively in the Strategic Plan, and that will be the end product of this process.

Professor Helgert inquired about the goal of moving GW into a globally preeminent position, and asked Chair Carbonell if he could outline several of the changes or improvements that he or the Board are contemplating to make that happen. Chair Carbonell responded that the primary vehicle that the Board has communicated for moving

GW forward is the Strategic Plan. The Board participated in the development of the Plan, as did some members of the Senate, and that is the roadmap for how it will move the institution forward. He added he thought that the Plan was fantastic and has wonderful goals, and that is where all of the answers can be found concerning what the Board wants to do, because it was really very diligent in making sure it understood the Plan and that when it approved the Plan, this was the right way to go.

UPDATE ON THE LYTERATI PROJECT (FACULTY ANNUAL REPORTS)

Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Dianne Martin presented an update on the status of the online faculty annual report system. The good news is that there are only about 40 faculty [out of 1100] who did not manage to get their reports filed thru the Lyterati system. This is a very good result, considering that it was a struggle for many people, as the technology turned out to be a little more difficult to use than anticipated.

Going forward, a Faculty Information System Advisory Committee (FISAC) comprised of faculty members from each of the schools will be established to work with the Administration not only on the system interface, but also, more importantly, on the stewardship of the data that is being collected through the system. Proposed membership of the FISAC is listed on the handout Vice Provost Martin distributed at the meeting.

A large amount of data has been collected during the first year of this project. The Medical School was the one school that did not come into the Lyterati system yet as they had their own system in place. With all of the lessons learned last year, the Medical School should have a much smoother transition this year when it implements the system. The goal is to have all of the faculty annual reports come in through the Lyterati system in a transactionalized way that will create a large repository of information about all of the publications of the faculty as well as their teaching, research, and service. This information will be available in ways that it has not been before. Because the Administration is aware there is a lot of concern about the stewardship of the information collected, the FISAC will formulate recommendations concerning how the data collected can be used. As an example, Vice Provost Martin said that a request has already been received from the Undergraduate Fellowship Office asking for information about all of the faculty who reported they had been mentoring undergraduate students in research projects. The FISAC will play a key role in developing guidelines for the sharing of information collected in the Lyterati system.

Referring to information distributed at the meeting, Vice Provost Martin advised that the plan for the FISAC's work was developed in consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee over the summer. The first objective is to find a way to improve the accuracy of information reported last year, as the interface was not optimal. Last year's system did not change the information collected in faculty annual reports; what was changed was the method by which the information was provided to the Administration. Going forward, one goal is to make the interface much more intuitive so it more closely resembles the Annual Report format in terms of its look and feel, and the way in which information is gathered. Hopefully, the improved interface will help faculty users more easily understand how to input data into the system.

The final task for the FISAC will be to develop recommendations around the use of the data captured in the Lyterati system and to bring these recommendations forward to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. (A timeline for the work of the FISAC is included in the handout included with these minutes.)

Professor Castleberry confessed that he was one of the 40 people whose information is not currently in the Lyterati system. It seems there is a high level of confidence that everything faculty members submitted last year truly reflected what they wanted to include. However, he said many people had contacted him to say that they could not figure out how to make the system work so that everything was included. Whenever something of this importance to the faculty is implemented without any prior faculty input, it compromises the right of faculty members to be consulted about administrative matters that affect them. There is a real need to see an improved and streamlined version of the system which can produce an all-incorporating and all-encompassing record that accurately captures each faculty members' information. Vice Provost Martin responded that this would part of the work of the FISAC, and noted that Professor Castleberry would be serving as a member of that group. In fact, the Lyterati system was piloted in the School of Engineering, so there was some confidence in rolling it out that the faculty would be able to use it. In addition, there were a large number of training sessions and one on one support was provided for anyone who requested it. That is probably why the rollout of the system ultimately captured information from 99% of the people for whose use it was intended. Vice Provost Martin concluded her remarks on this topic by assuring everyone that she has been working with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and would continue to do so, and further, that there would be no more unpleasant surprises.

BRIEF UPDATE ON CHANGES TO THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY REQUESTED BY THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Vice Provost Martin next turned to a short overview of changes requested by the National Institutes of Health to the University's Conflict of Interest Policy. The Senate will recall that over a year ago it approved an addendum to the faculty Conflict of Interest and Commitments Policy because of new requirements imposed by NIH on all faculty involved in Public Health Service research. With the Senate's help the Policy was amended without the Policy undergoing total revision, but it was understood that it would probably be a good idea to revisit the entire Policy with a view toward streamlining it and pulling out a lot of the procedural information so there would remain a clear Policy that the faculty could follow and understand. In addition, there is a need for procedural forms to be updated.

Vice Provost Martin distributed an information sheet describing the process that will be used in this academic year to review the entire Conflict of Interest Policy and recommend revisions. (That information is included with these minutes.) As this plan was under development, the University received another letter from NIH requesting four additional changes to the Conflict of Interest Policy. Vice Provost Martin characterized these recommended changes as minor and developed a way in which the Policy might be amended quickly, mostly in the form of corrections to footnotes in the Policy. The Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom has been asked to come forward with a Resolution for consideration by the Senate very quickly to approve these minor edits. In terms of the larger task of revisions to the entire Policy, the University's Office of General

Counsel has provided an analysis of Conflict of Interest Policies from across the country as well as an outline of best practices in preparation for the upcoming review which will hopefully succeed in devising a new, more elegant and refined Policy.

UPDATE ON EMPLOYEE FRINGE BENEFITS CONSULTATION AND BENEFITS FOR THE 2014 PLAN YEAR

Vice President for Human Resources Sabrina Ellis presented the update on employee benefits for the 2014 plan year. She began her presentation by thanking the many individuals across the University, particularly members of the Benefits Advisory Committee and the Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies (including fringe benefits), who have helped to work with staff in the Human Resources office to review a myriad of policies and develop the new benefit plan, as well as review relevant provisions of the soon-to-be-implemented Affordable Care Act.

The overall amount spent on benefits for the 2014 plan year is projected to be \$98.5 million. The University contributes about \$83.5 of that amount, or approximately 85%. Employees contribute approximately 15%. Of the overall \$98.5 million total expended for benefits, medical and prescription drug expenses are projected to amount to \$44 million for the 2014 plan year. Vice President Ellis noted that if the University made no changes to the plans currently offered, the total next year would amount to about \$46 million, which would represent a 25% increase in employee contributions. Several rounds of analysis have been conducted to review how the University can make some modifications to bring that number down, with the result that the increase has been reduced by half, or 12.5%.

Vice President Ellis provided some context concerning these numbers. Many have seen in the media that there have been some very wild shifts in the external marketplace. It is no surprise that the rate of growth for health insurance costs is increasing. On a positive note, GW's premiums are below the national average, and they are also below the regional average. In line with that, both components of the cost for GW's health insurance plans, out of pocket costs and premiums – are each also below the national average, these comparisons being with costs at other colleges and universities. Another factor in the external marketplace is what other employers are doing with spousal coverage. They are taking the position that they are insuring their employees, and a number of them have dropped coverage for spouses who are able to obtain affordable coverage through their own employers. Some recent examples of that are the University of Virginia and Ball State University.

Health care reform has also meant changes to the University's offerings. All of its insurance plans will be required to have an out of pocket maximum, which means there has to be a threshold beyond which insurance plans pay costs covered by the plan at 100%. This is not something which has been included on the Premium (Choice) plan in previous years, though it has been on the Basic (Blue) and Medium (Buff) plans, and it will be introduced on the Premium plan in the 2014 plan year. University staff are also observing that health care coverage can be obtained through the soon-to-be-launched health insurance exchanges expected to be available on October 1 and the University will be providing further information on these close to the October 1 date. The point of this is that the exchanges

are an option for people who cannot obtain affordable care through their employers, such as those whose employers who have dropped spousal coverage.

Vice President Ellis related that the University will continue to offer three health insurance plans. These three plans will now be referred to as basic, medium and premium, in-network only. The basic and medium plans include in-network and out-of-network care. Detailed information on the plans will be provided to University employees in time for them to review this before open enrollment begins. In response to a query about the premium plan, Vice President Ellis clarified that an in-network plan means in-network only, meaning this would not be a good option for employees whose care is mostly obtained from physicians outside the network. If this is an employee's situation, then the basic or medium plans are going to be the ones they should look to.

In looking at the plans overall, the University's premium and out of pocket costs are lower than the averages. In order for the University to make sure it is keeping its premiums at a certain rate it typically reviews plan designs and make changes to them. In terms of employee contribution increases, there will be increases of \$10 to \$90 per month depending upon the plan and tier of the plan selected. The extended network will continue to be offered. There will be some changes in copayments, and coverage for hospital in-and outpatient costs, as well as the coinsurance rate. Prescription drug co-pays for a 30 day supply have also increased over the past two years from \$5 to \$10 last year, and to \$15 for the 2014 plan year. Vice President Ellis added that it's always better if an employee is on maintenance medication to order a 90 day supply, as this saves money not only for the individual but also overall for other members in the plan. In terms of dental and vision coverages, employees will see very slight increases. There will be no increases for basic or enhanced vision coverage. Some of the plans do not have increases, and those that do have a very small increase (\$2 per month). One benefit addition to dental coverage this year is that the PPO high plan will include dental implants. Vice President Ellis distributed a handout to the Senate describing these increases (the handout is included with these minutes).

One change has been made in terms of the provider for disability benefits. Up to this point the University's plan was administered by UNUM, however, a lot of complaints have been received from people utilizing this benefit. A survey was sent out, and based on that feedback, the University sought another vendor and will be introducing that one in the 2014 plan year. Beginning September 1, 2013, the University introduced a wellbeing hotline. There are a number of different circumstances where Human Resources staff or people in the GW community can use it.

Also new this year is another move toward creating a more family friendly environment. After receiving feedback from a lot of people noting that GW did not offer a parental leave benefit for staff, the University will next year offer a new paid parental leave program for staff who have been with the University for at least two years. These employees will be able to take paid parental leave for 6 weeks.

Many people on campus have seen the "Let's Share the Air" signs on campus. GW went smoke-free on August 1st. This was done as a soft launch because it seemed desirable to provide a means for obtaining feedback about this initiative. Quite a number of

comments, the majority of which have been overwhelmingly positive, have been received. The comment period extends until October 1.

In conclusion, Vice President Ellis noted that benefits open enrollment will start on October 1. While previously this consisted of a 2 or 3 week period, it will now last the entire month of October. As was done in previous years, benefit fairs will be offered and the dates for these will be posted on the Human Resources website. In addition to these, last year Human Resources introduced one-o-one counseling for anybody who wants to ask questions about plan designs or plans they should move toward. These will be offered again this year as well. A number of brown bag lunch meetings were held last year; these were very effective and people seemed to be really appreciative that these were offered.

Discussion followed. Professor Roddis asked about eligibility for the paid parental leave benefit, i.e., if full-time special service faculty, for example, faculty members teaching language courses in Columbian College, are entitled to a paid parental leave benefit. Vice President Ellis responded that faculty members do receive a parental leave benefit consisting of a semester off from teaching and research. Professor Roddis noted that there has been a problem since the establishment of the special service category of faculty. Contrary to their expectations, these faculty find out too late that they are not covered under parental leave benefits for either faculty or staff. For example, several years ago, a request for parental leave for a special service faculty member was denied.

Vice Provost Martin said that the distinction between special service and regular, active-status faculty is not in their benefits, but chiefly in their opportunity to participate in governance. In addition, parental leave can be granted at the discretion of the Provost. Professor Galston said she was under the impression that parental leave is automatic for faculty, if only for the first child. It does have to be approved by the Provost, but it is not (as she understood it) discretionary.

In view of the uncertainty concerning this issue, President Knapp suggested that it would be a good for these questions to be explored by Vice President Ellis and Vice Provost Martin, and for a clear answer to be provided to the Senate about the present situation concerning parental leave for faculty members. Note on information pertaining to this question following the meeting: the University's Policy on Parental Childcare Leave (for faculty members) can be found in Article VI. D. of the *Faculty Code*, that amendment being approved February 8, 2008 by the Board of Trustees – see the insert including this amendment on Page 4 of the *Code* at this link:

http://www.gwu.edu/~facsen/faculty_senate/pdf/2004Code.pdf

Professor Price inquired if the University was considering eliminating spousal coverage as other institutions are doing, and Vice President Ellis responded it is not at this time. Professor Helgert requested some information about the pharmacy collective mentioned in the handout. Vice President Ellis responded that this essentially allows the University a greater wholesale ability in terms of how prescription drugs are obtained, and it helps to keep prices down. This is important because prescription drug utilization has gone up for the GW group, so the University will participate in the collective for the first time in 2014. Professor Helgert asked if an employee obtains prescription drugs from CVS how the

collective would connect to that. Vice President Ellis said that the collective will provide an additional wholesale capability in addition to that provided by CVS. The collective is comprised of approximately 900,000 employers and so additional purchasing discounts will become available through it.

Professor Marotta-Walters said she recalled that several years ago when the University changed its insurance provider from Blue Cross to United Health Care, one of the reasons was because the claims history with UHC was expected to be better, and she asked if this had proved to be the case. Vice President Ellis said there are two answers to that. GW is self-insured and what the cost in terms of employees going to the doctor and GW employees' health insurance costs, the University has to cover. The experience with Blue Cross/Blue Shield was that they were not doing a diligent enough job of working with providers to ensure they were using the appropriate types of codes for services that GW employees were receiving, and so additional costs were a result. The switch to UHC has produced reduced claims costs through a better service experience, but a lot of that has to do with the way in which UHC is administering the plans. Professor Brazinsky asked about the wide range of percentage increases -- \$5 in some cases, and \$35 to \$50 for others -- for different parts of the plans, Vice President Ellis said the process for determining these is a review of each plan and a comparison with what is happening in the marketplace. The goal is to keep copays consistent with what the marketplace reflects. The University also looks to keep increases tolerable and to balance what people pay when they go to the doctor with what the entire population has to pay as a whole. Professor Brazinsky asked if the increases reflect more people using specialists, and Vice President Ellis responded that she could not answer that definitively, but it does reflect additional costs in claims as well as the experience last year of an increase in chronic illnesses among the GW population. Some of those resulted in large expenses to the benefits pool as a whole, so the increase are a way of balancing those costs across all of the plans. That is why some changes have been made in terms of deductibles and in copayments.

Professor Yezer renewed his plea that a financial planning benefit be made available for faculty and staff. Professor Parsons said he had recently had reason to look at the tuition exchange program, and added that he found very it inadequate. None of the marketbasket schools GW compares itself with are on the list of institutions that can be selected. Professor Parsons said he thought it would a good idea to review this program and come up with a list of schools that are comparable to GW now rather than forty years ago. Vice President Ellis said that this could be added to the list of things to review next year.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I. ELECTION OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Professor Rehman moved the nominations of the following faculty members to Senate Standing Committees: Educational Policy: Elias Balaras, Elias Caryannis, Michael Duffey, and Robert W. Rycroft. Professor Lilien Robinson was nominated from the floor. Physical Facilities: Arlene Pericak; Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom: Michael S. Castleberry, Jennifer Frey, and Kate Malliarakis. Professors Brian Biles and

Murray Loew were nominated from the floor. Appointment, Salary, and Promotion Policies: Professors Eugene Abravanel and Sylvia Marotta-Walters were nominated from the floor.

All of the nominees were elected.

II. ELECTION OF FACULTY MEMBERS FOR APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT TO ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES

Professor Rehman moved the nomination of Professor Beverly Westerman to the University Hearing Board and she was elected.

III. ANNUAL REPORTS OF SENATE COMMITTEES

The Annual Report of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee was made available at the meeting and is included with these minutes.

IV: REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Rehman presented the report, which is included with these minutes. As noted in the report, the Report of the Executive Committee at the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees meeting in May, 2013 is included with these minutes.

V. PROVOST'S REMARKS

Mindful of the hour, Provost Lerman said he would focus his remarks on three things, the first of which was a great pleasure. He said he and the Chair of the Senate Executive Committee had an opportunity, with many others including deans and department chairs, to greet new faculty members arriving this year. As in previous years, the Provost hosted this event at his home on the Mount Vernon campus. Once again, he said he was extraordinarily impressed with the quality of the young scholars who chose to come to the University, and it is always an endless source of optimism to meet them. They are intelligent, motivated, well educated, excited to be here and it is just a joy to welcome them to the GW community. Their interest and excitement are always palpable when one is a room with them. It is the role of senior faculty to mentor them, help them find ways for their careers to be as successful as possible, and to continue to persuade them that they made the absolutely best choice by coming to GW. The Provost thanked everyone who participated in attracting these new faculty members to GW as part of the recruitment process in their departments and schools, and added that he thought the academic year is off to a great start with this cohort.

The Provost then said a few words about matters pertaining to the GW School of Business. A decanal transition was announced 2 or 3 weeks ago and the Provost said that he had met with the entire faculty of the Business School the day after the announcement that Doug Guthrie would no longer be serving as dean. Meetings were also held with the leadership of the MBA association, the Business School staff, and the Senate Executive Committee. A meeting will be scheduled to meet with the leadership of the School of Business' undergraduate student body during this transition.

Two days ago, the Provost said he announced that Professor Chris Kayes will serve as the interim Dean of the School. Provost Lerman said he thought his meeting with the School of Business faculty that morning was a pivot point, as there was a frank and honest discussion about finances, and it was a meeting entered into in the spirit of looking forward. The School of Business is important to the University success, and it is a unit that must continue to succeed. The Provost expressed every confidence in Interim Dean Kayes' leadership in the coming days. A search for the next Dean (which will follow the usual search procedures) will commence shortly, beginning with a request that the school's faculty elect a search committee to work with the Administration in the search.

Lastly, Provost Lerman commented on the implementation of the University's Strategic Plan. Provost Lerman said he would be working on this with the faculty, including the Senate Executive Committee and its designees. The Provost reiterated that this is a multi-year plan and everything in the Strategic Plan cannot be done in one year; some of the things in the Plan may require reconsideration and some actions not now in the Plan may be added. So the focus of the Implementation phase will be on actions to be taken this year. The Provost said he would soon be writing up a more detailed outline focusing on four key areas.

The first key area of concern is academics, and there is nothing that could be more central to faculty governance than academics. Some of the issues are relatively straightforward, but they are important and of great value. For example, one of these things was an input into the Strategic Plan from a student who attended one of the town hall meetings, and the issue raised was improving tools that help students help plan their educational experience, specifically the DEGREEMAP software. The University will be looking at ways to eliminate many of the restrictions students face with respect to taking classes in a school other than the one in which they are registered. Currently, many combinations of dual majors are not permitted, and there is a bewildering array of restrictions that have accumulated over time. Each one of these will be reviewed with a view toward determining if there is any compelling reason the restrictions have to persist. This is something GW students want very much. Provost Lerman said that he had sat in on several admissions sessions over the years, attended by students who are high school juniors and seniors and their parents who to visit the GW campus. Almost always a parent or student asks the same question, i.e., what if the student enrolls in one school and after coming to the University, has a change of mind about which school is really the best choice. The idea is that the University should be more integrated to permit this, and GW will be moving down the road to that integration.

The second area is an issue that the Senate has raised, particularly through its Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee. This is also something that the Provost said he pledged to do relatively soon after he arrived. Admittedly, it has been slow to happen. But this is the year that the University will be moving forward with a new budget model for those of the schools that are under the Unified Budget Model. This is work that will be enabled by the arrival of Rene Stewart O'Neal, the new Vice Provost for Budget and Finance. She will be working with Senior Vice Provost Forrest Maltzman and others, including people in the schools, to re-examine the budget model and move toward one that is more transparent and better maps the incentives the schools have financially to achieve their goals. That will provide a strong foundation going forward for figuring out how the

resources of the University should be allocated to the schools. The Provost said again that this was something he believed is a bit overdue and something he thought the University can move forward with this year.

The third area is interdisciplinary research, and that is moving forward by continuing the process begun by Vice President for Research Leo Chalupa when he arrived here. He has fostered a larger number of interdisciplinary institutes and attracted faculty to them who, while they have homes in the academic departments like all faculty, come to GW with an abiding interest in those areas that need and require working across disciplines. The Provost said he envisioned over the course of the Plan rolling out one or two more of these interdisciplinary institutes out each year. Each of these comes with seed funding and each of them may or may not involve new faculty lines depending upon whether the Administration thinks it has the resources, in terms of faculty members, to do that research

The fourth area is continuing to focus on a globalization strategy. With the change in leadership in the Business school there is also a need for a change in leadership with respect to the China operations. China is one of the many areas in which the University has international programs. At the President's request, that portfolio for the meantime has moved to the Provost's office and Provost Lerman said he would take direct responsibility for it. That may or may not be a permanent situation. It is possible the University will recruit someone to help the University advance its strategy in China academics and research. At the same time the University will continue to look not just at China but how GW as an institution engages globally. This includes how GW students learn global skills, how faculty engage in global research, what the opportunities and the risks are, and how the University navigates a careful strategy to preserve its core academic values while still engaging in a complicated world in which higher education has very different forms and very different styles of regulation. This will be a carefully constructed process, and the University will continue to work closely within the faculty governance structure as it unfolds.

VI. CHAIR'S REMARKS

President Knapp commented briefly on the launch of the academic year, saying he thought it was an interesting reminder that one of the things that attracts students to GW, as is often said, is the opportunity to have a front row seat in the theater of history here in the nation's capital. That was brought home on August 28th with the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the March on Washington and the extraordinary address given by the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. at the Lincoln Memorial on the National Mall.

Thanks to Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion Terri Reed, a really extraordinary and well attended event was held in Lisner Auditorium, Julian Bond, one of the participants in the original Civil Rights movement, gave a keynote address and GW students performed a theatrical presentation very effectively written by them. The event also featured some extraordinary music. The occasion provided an opportunity for those present to reflect on the University's own rather complex history of involvement with the civil rights movement, including the fact that one of the very first institutions that was integrated here in Washington, D.C. was Lisner Auditorium. That happened in 1947 after Ingrid Bergman came to Washington to appear in a play there and was shocked to discover that the recently

opened facility was segregated. Her protest of that segregation was joined by a number of GW students, particularly student veterans who had just returned from fighting a war against racism around the world, particularly against the Nazi regime, and were shocked to find this kind of segregation in the heart of their University. Despite the fact that the Board of Trustees agreed to desegregate Lisner Auditorium in 1947 it wasn't until 1954 that the University itself as a whole was integrated – a sobering reflection. It took 7 years to move from a desegregated auditorium to actually applying that to the University itself. But as a result of that there were African American students at GW, including the current mayor, Vincent Gray, who were able to walk from the campus to the mall in 1963 to hear Dr. King's address.

President Knapp next commented on the Freshman Convocation and the Freshman Day of Service. As a result of an earthquake several years ago, a shift was made in the timing of the Freshman Convocation because the earthquake was followed almost immediately by a hurricane. The hurricane did not completely materialize, but nevertheless it meant a postponement of the Convocation, and so both events happened on the same day that had been set aside for the Freshman Day of Service, an event that this year marks the 5th time the event has commemorated the terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001 on the United States. This event has grown year after year and takes place in the Smith Center. It begins with the President, Provost and the Deans marching into the Center in their academic regalia before an academic ceremony begins. Following that, while a video plays on screen the administrators go backstage and exchange their medieval garb for more work-friendly attire, including Freshman Day of Service t-shirts. After another round of speeches, everyone boards buses and travels to perform community service projects in each of the 8 wards of the District of Columbia and several surrounding counties. This year over 2,400 students participated in these projects, and the President said he thought it really brings home to students the connection between their academic engagement and the whole tradition of citizen leadership that goes back all the way back to George Washington's vision for the University.

A more solemn event was held earlier in the week on Wednesday with the 12th vigil in remembrance of the victims of the Sept. 11th attacks, including nine of the University's alumni. There was an extraordinary address there by a student who was a first grader when his father was lost in the World Trade Center attack. The President said he was quite impressed by the fact that such a large number of students showed up for the event, filling up a sizeable proportion of the University yard where the ceremony is held. The candlelight vigil is always a very solemn and very moving ceremony. It is interesting to reflect that freshmen and sophomores at the University were probably in kindergarten or first grade when the terrorist attack occurred, and that it was such a formative event in their lives. This vigil is something the University will continue to hold for years to come because it commemorates something that was such an extraordinary event for them.

President Knapp concluded his remarks by saying that the Administration is looking for an opportunity to come before the Senate with a presentation about the various new things the University is doing in or related to China. The University recently opened finance and accountancy programs in Suzhou Industrial Park in China, and is exploring the possibility of locating programs in Beijing. Last spring marked the opening of the Columbian College's Confucius Institute in a renovated townhouse at the corner of F and

21st Streets. Of course, the University has had a very distinguished tradition of scholarship on China for many years, and some of the world's leading China experts are on the faculty of the Elliott School of International Affairs and elsewhere. The University has been attracting larger and larger numbers of Chinese students, both undergraduate, and graduate, to GW. In fact, China is now the largest single source of international students who attend the University.

One of the most important factors in determining which programs go forward in or related to China is faculty consultation and faculty planning concerning academic programs. The President said his approach to international programs has always been and will always remain that these need to be worked out in consultation with the faculty because what is critical is that the University does not undertake new programs just because there are opportunities to do so. Rather, it launches them because they are extensions and expressions of the University's academic mission and values and they are opportunities for the University to expand its global footprint

The Administration will be meeting with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on September 27 to discuss this proposed presentation to the Senate. For those new to the Senate, the process is to discuss with the Executive Committee potential items for the upcoming Senate meeting, and that is the way in which the list of agenda items is established. There are somewhat independent activities and programs related to China that are either under discussion or underway and those include the School of Medicine and Health Sciences as well as the Business School. There are also opportunities for other schools who are interested in potentially looking at the kind of model that was established in Suzhou as something they might emulate. Future directions are still to be determined and discussions will continue with faculty engaged in each of the steps of this process.

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

There were no brief statements or questions.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 3:57 p.m.

Elizabeth A. Amundson

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

**A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE POLICY ON CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
AND COMMITMENT FOR FACULTY AND INVESTIGATORS (13/2)**

WHEREAS, The current Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment for Faculty and Investigators was approved by the Faculty Senate of The George Washington University on January 21, 2005, and by The George Washington University Board of Trustees February 11, 2005; and,

WHEREAS, Upon review by the Division of Grants Compliance and Oversight, Office of Policy for Extramural Research Administration, Office of Extramural Research, National Institutes of Health, officials made recommendations for amending the GW Policy in order to insure compliance with NIH's revised 2011 conflict of interest regulations; and,

WHEREAS, The proposed amendments appear to be minor clarifications of existing policy and do not change the substance of our approved policy; and,

WHEREAS, The GW Administration has requested that we expedite approval of these amendments to avoid further audit by NIH;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE
GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

That the amendments shown in redline in the attached "POLICY ON CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND COMMITMENT FOR FACULTY AND INVESTIGATORS" be accepted as GW Policy.

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
September 30, 2013

POLICY ON CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND COMMITMENT FOR FACULTY AND INVESTIGATORS

Investigator (and those of the Investigator's spouse/domestic partner and dependent children) that reasonably appears to be related to the Investigator's Institutional Responsibilities:

(a) With regard to any *publicly traded entity*, a Significant Financial Interest exists if the value of any remuneration received from the entity in the twelve months preceding the disclosure and the value of any equity interest in the entity as of the date of disclosure, when aggregated, exceeds \$5,000. For purposes of this definition, remuneration includes salary and any payment for services not otherwise identified as salary (e.g., consulting fees, honoraria, paid authorship); equity interest includes any stock, stock option, or other ownership interest, as determined through reference to public prices or other reasonable measures of fair market value;

(b) With regard to any *non-publicly traded entity*, a Significant Financial Interest exists if the value of any remuneration received from the entity in the twelve months preceding the disclosure, when aggregated, exceeds \$5,000, or when the Investigator (or the Investigator's spouse/domestic partner or dependent children) holds any equity interest (e.g., stock, stock option, or other ownership interest);

(c) Intellectual property rights and interests (e.g., patents, copyrights), upon receipt of income related to such rights and interests in the twelve months preceding the disclosure; or

(d) **The occurrence of any reimbursed or sponsored travel in the twelve months preceding the disclosure.**⁴

Financial Disclosures by Investigators

In addition to the disclosure obligations set forth in Section III.B and C of the Policy, each Investigator planning to participate in PHS-funded research must disclose to the dean or the dean's designee the Investigator's Significant Financial Interests (and those of the Investigator's spouse/domestic partner and dependent children) no later than the time of application for the PHS-funded research.

Each Investigator participating in PHS-funded research must update his or her disclosure annually during the period of the award to reflect any information not disclosed initially or updates to any previously-disclosed Significant Financial Interests (e.g., the updated value of

investment vehicles, such as mutual funds and retirement accounts, as long as the Investigator does not directly control the investment decisions made in these vehicles; (3) income from seminars, lectures, or teaching engagements sponsored by a Federal, state, or local government agency, an institution of higher education, an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute that is affiliated with an institution of higher education; (4) income from service on advisory committees or review panels for a Federal, state, or local government agency, an institution of higher education, an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute that is affiliated with an Institution of higher education; or (5) travel that is reimbursed or sponsored by a Federal, state, or local government agency, an institution of higher education, an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute that is affiliated with an institution of higher education.

³ A financial interest is anything of monetary value, whether or not the value is readily ascertainable.

⁴ Sponsored travel means travel that is paid on behalf of the Investigator and not reimbursed to the Investigator (so that the exact monetary amount may not be readily determined). The disclosure of reimbursed or sponsored travel must include, at a minimum, the purpose of the trip, the identity of the sponsor/organization, the destination, and the duration.

POLICY ON CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND COMMITMENT FOR FACULTY AND INVESTIGATORS

previously disclosed equity interests). Investigators are also required to report a new Significant Financial Interest within 30 days of discovering or acquiring the interest.

Review and Management of Financial Disclosures

Investigators' disclosures of Significant Financial Interests under this Appendix C must be reviewed by the dean or the dean's designee. Such review shall include a determination of whether an Investigator's Significant Financial Interest is related to a PHS-funded research project at the University and, if so, whether the Significant Financial Interest constitutes a financial conflict of interest.

An Investigator's Significant Financial Interest is related to PHS-funded research when (a) the Significant Financial Interest could be affected by the PHS-funded research or (b) the Significant Financial Interest is in an entity whose financial interest could be affected by the research.

A financial conflict of interest exists when an Investigator's Significant Financial Interest could directly and significantly affect the design, conduct, or reporting of PHS-funded research. The University will take such actions as are necessary to manage financial conflicts of interest in PHS-funded research, including, prior to the expenditure of PHS award funds, development and implementation of a management plan that specifies the actions that have been or will be taken to manage, reduce or eliminate the financial conflict of interest.⁵ Management plans must be approved by the dean (or designee) and the Provost and Executive Vice President.

Whenever, in the course of an ongoing PHS-funded research project, a Significant Financial Interest is disclosed by a new Investigator or an existing Investigator discloses a Significant Financial Interest not previously reported, or it comes to the attention of University officials that a Significant Financial Interest related to the PHS-funded research was not disclosed in a timely manner by an Investigator, the interest shall be reviewed within 60 days and a decision shall be made as to whether the Significant Financial Interest constitutes a financial conflict of interest. If the University determines that a financial conflict of interest exists, the University shall implement, on at least an interim basis, a management plan that shall specify the actions that have been, or will be taken, to manage the Financial Conflict of Interest.

Financial Conflict of Interest Reports by the University

Prior to the expenditure of any funds under a PHS-funded research award, the University is required to submit to the PHS Awarding Component a financial conflict of interest report ("Report") regarding any Significant Financial Interests related to the PHS-funded research that the University finds to be conflicting and implement a management plan as set forth in this

⁵ Examples of management strategies include but are not limited to: (i) Public disclosure of financial conflicts of interest (e.g., when presenting or publishing the research); (ii) For research projects involving human subjects research, disclosure of financial conflicts of interest directly to participants; (iii) Appointment of an independent monitor capable of taking measures to protect the design, conduct, and reporting of the research against bias resulting from the financial conflict of interest; (iv) Modification of the research plan; (v) Change of personnel or personnel responsibilities, or disqualification of personnel from participation in all or a portion of the research; (vi) Reduction or elimination of the financial interest (e.g., sale of an equity interest); or (vii) Severance of relationships that create financial conflicts.

POLICY ON CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND COMMITMENT FOR FACULTY AND INVESTIGATORS

Appendix C. In addition, during the course of a PHS-funded research project, the University will provide the PHS Awarding Component with a Report, and implement a management plan, within 60 days of identifying any Significant Financial Interest that the University identifies as conflicting subsequent to its initial Report.⁶

For any financial conflict of interest previously reported by the University to PHS, the University shall provide updated Reports annually for the duration of the PHS-funded research project (including extensions with or without funds) in the time and manner specified by the PHS Awarding Component.⁷

Any required Reports shall be submitted to the PHS Awarding Component by the Office of the Vice President for Research.

Retrospective Reviews

If the University identifies a Significant Financial Interest that was not disclosed timely by the Investigator or, for whatever reason, was not previously reviewed by the University during an ongoing PHS-funded research project (e.g., was not timely reviewed or reported by a subrecipient), the University shall, within sixty days: review the Significant Financial Interest, determine whether it is related to PHS-funded research, determine whether a financial conflict of interest exists, and if so, implement, on at least an interim basis, a management plan that shall specify the actions that have been, and will be, taken to manage such financial conflict of interest going forward.

In addition, whenever a financial conflict of interest in PHS-funded research is not identified or managed in a timely manner, the University must, within 120 days of the determination of noncompliance, complete a retrospective review of the Investigator's activities and the PHS-funded research project to determine whether any PHS-funded research, or portion thereof, conducted during the time period of noncompliance, was biased in the design, conduct, or reporting of such research. The University is required to document the review in accordance with PHS requirements.

Based on the results of the retrospective review, the University will, if appropriate, update the previously submitted Reports affected by the review, specifying the actions that will be taken to manage the financial conflict of interest going forward. If the retrospective review determines that the research was biased in its design, conduct or reporting, the University, through the Office of the Vice President for Research, will promptly notify and submit a mitigation report to PHS.

Furthermore, in any case in which the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services determines that a PHS-funded project of clinical research evaluating the safety or effectiveness

⁶ The University is not required to submit a financial conflict of interest report to PHS if it identifies and eliminates a financial conflict of interest prior to the expenditure of PHS-awarded funds.

⁷ For National Institutes of Health ("NIH") grants and cooperative agreements, this reporting is submitted through the electronic Research Administration (eRA) Commons Financial Conflict of Interest Module and is due at the same time as the required NIH annual progress report, multi-year progress report, if applicable, or at the time of extension.

POLICY ON CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND COMMITMENT FOR FACULTY AND INVESTIGATORS

of a drug, medical device or treatment has been designed, conducted or reported by an Investigator with a conflicting interest that was not managed or reported by the University as required by this Appendix C, the University shall require the Investigator to disclose the conflicting interest in each public presentation of the results of the research and to request an addendum to previously published presentations.

Maintenance and Disclosure of Records

In accordance with PHS requirements, the University must maintain records relating to all financial disclosures made by Investigators engaged in PHS-funded research, as well as the University's review of, and response to, such disclosures (whether or not a disclosure resulted in the University's determination of a financial conflict of interest) and all actions taken under the Policy and this Appendix C (including any retrospective review, if applicable) for at least three years from submission of the final expenditures report for a grant or cooperative agreement and three years after final payment for a contract, or for such longer periods as prescribed in applicable regulations, and will make such records available in appropriate circumstances for inspection and review upon request by duly authorized agencies.

In addition, the University, through the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President, will provide a written response to a requestor within five business days of receiving a request for information concerning a Significant Financial Interest held by a Project Director/Principal Investigator and any other person identified by the University to PHS as senior/key personnel if the University has determined that the Significant Financial Interest constitutes a financial conflict of interest in PHS-funded research.⁸

Subgrantees, Contractors, and Collaborators

If the University carries out PHS-funded research through a subrecipient (e.g., subgrantees, contractors, or collaborators), the University, through the Office of the Vice President for Research, will include in its written agreement with the subrecipient a statement as to whether the financial conflicts of interest policy of the University or that of the subrecipient applies to the subrecipient's Investigators.

If the subrecipient's financial conflicts of interest policy applies to subrecipient Investigators, the subrecipient shall certify as part of the agreement that its policy complies with the PHS

⁸ Per the PHS regulations, the information that the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President will make available in the written response will include the following:

- The Investigator's name
- The Investigator's title and role with respect to the research project
- The name of the entity in which the Significant Financial Interest is held
- The nature of the Significant Financial Interest
- The approximate dollar value of the Significant Financial Interest (dollar ranges are permissible: \$0-\$4,999; \$5,000-\$9,999; \$10,000-\$19,999; amounts between \$20,000-\$100,000 by increments of \$20,000; amounts above \$100,000 by increments of \$50,000) or a statement that the interest is one whose value cannot be readily determined through reference to public prices or other reasonable measures of fair market value. The written response will note that the information provided is current as of the date of the correspondence and is subject to updates consistent with the PHS regulations. **The information provided to the requestor will remain available for three years from the date that the information was most recently updated.**

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Scheherazade S. Rehman, Chair

September 13, 2013

First, I want to welcome all of the new members of the Senate as well as any of the newly-introduced guests who still may be present.

I would like to thank the University Board of Trustees Nelson Carbonell for providing the Senate with an overview of the Board of Trustees' interest in reviewing University governance. I would very strongly encourage Board of Trustees Chair Carbonell to involve faculty in this complex process from start to finish...in all phases of this endeavor. I would very strongly caution Chair Carbonell and the Board of Trustees that the process is as important as the end result. The Senate Executive Committee, the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee, and the Senate look forward to receiving the findings of Chair Carbonell's taskforce and reviewing them.

I would also like to thank Vice Provost Dianne Martin for her update on Lyterati and the Conflict of Interest Policy. I hope that she and her committee have addressed the key faculty on Lyterati issues by the time we have to fill out the next set of annual reports in 2014. I also hope that it is a much more user-friendly, effective and efficient reporting system nine months from now for both faculty and administration since faculty annual reports are the most important record-keeping document for faculty.

Additionally I would also very much like to thank Sabrina Ellis for the overview of Benefits for next year.

We have a full plate this year and the Executive Committee and I look forward very much to working with all of you.

In connection with that observation, I would like to request that Senate members who have not yet volunteered for Committee service consider doing so during the 2013-14 session, as we do try to staff the Committees with a faculty member from each School. Non-Senate members are welcome as well if any of you have colleagues who wish to volunteer.

The current Committee list is always posted on the Senate website, and the Senate Office will be happy to assist anyone pondering the multiple options available. For those Senate members who have already volunteered, we thank you and look forward to your input.

The Senate Executive Committee has once again had a busy summer.

1) Business before the Committee included conducting interviews and issuing recommendations to the Administration in connection with several nonconcurrences between faculty and administrative recommendations in promotion and/or tenure cases. Once the outcome of these matters is known, the results will be reported to the Senate.

2) A summer Executive Committee meeting was held in July at which the agenda for the 2013-14 session was reviewed, including prospective speakers and topics to be scheduled at upcoming Senate meetings and items for possible assignment to Standing Committees.

3) The Dispute Resolution Committee Chair, Professor Kurt Darr, has requested that the Executive Committee appoint several additional alternate temporary members to the Committee in order to deal with the significant caseload expected this Session. In response to this request, Executive Committee members have been asked to recommend one faculty member from each of their schools to serve in this capacity.

ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1) In connection with the implementation of the University's newly-approved Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence Policy, Vice Provost Reed requested that the Executive Committee give preliminary approval to a list of faculty members for panels that will consider these cases. The Executive Committee did so in June and added several suggestions of their own.

2) The Executive Committee was also invited by Senior Associate Dean for Military & Veterans Initiatives Melvin Williams, Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy (retired) to appoint a faculty member to the GW Valor Academic Council. Professor Robert Harrington, Chair of the Educational Policy Committee, has agreed to recommend a faculty member for this role.

Admiral Williams has also indicated his willingness to present a report on GW's veteran's initiatives at a Senate meeting during the Spring 2014 semester.

3) The Executive Committee discussed Vice Provost for Online Education Paul Berman's pilot program with regard to the first MOOC – online large class delivery program. We look forward to hearing from Vice Provost Berman once the new teaching platform has been delivered and we wish him the best on this pilot.

OTHER SENATE MATTERS

Appointments:

In response to Vice Provost's Martin's request for a faculty member from the School of Business to serve on the Lyterati Faculty Committee, the Business School elected Professor Paul Swiercz. Two other faculty members yet to be selected from the School of Public Health and Health Services, and the School of Engineering and Applied Science will also be recommended for this group.

A faculty member from the Business School will also be recommended as a member of the Conflict of Interest Policy Revision Committee.

Committee Assignments:

In addition to continuing business carried over from the 2012-13 Session, the Senate Standing Committees have or will be receiving specific charges for this year.

1) The Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom will have a role in considering recently proposed changes to the Conflict of Interest Policy as well as in the overall revision of the Policy itself during the next academic year.

This Committee has also been asked to advise the Executive Committee concerning whether or not the nonconcurrence process outlined in the *Faculty Code* should be utilized in cases when nonconcurrences in recommendations for promotion of non-tenured faculty occur.

2) The Joint Committee of Faculty and Students will be asked to review the University's Smoke-Free Policy, which was received by the Executive Committee in June 2013 and implemented on August 1, 2013.

Professor Paula Lantz, the Executive Committee representative from the School of Public Health and Health Services, has agreed to provide assistance and her expertise in this area to the Committee during its review this fall. We thank her for her hard work over the summer.

3) The Educational Policy Committee will be considering the formulation of recommendations for Senate action on the implementation phase of the new Strategic Plan.

It is also expected that other Senate Committees may be tasked with similar assignments once clear guidance is received from the Administration on the areas for Senate review/action and the timetable for same.

The items above are not meant to provide a complete list all of the matters that will come before Senate Committees this year but is rather those upon which early action will be required.

We will keep everyone updated on matters assigned during the session.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

ANNUAL FACULTY ASSEMBLY

The Faculty Assembly will meet on Tuesday, October 1, 2013 at 2 p.m. in the Jack Morton Auditorium, School of Media and Public Affairs, First Floor. A reception will follow the Assembly in the Brady Gallery on the second floor. This is the event at which new faculty members are introduced, and this year, newly-elected Chair of the Board of Trustees Nelson A. Carbonell, Jr. will address the Assembly.

Please remind everyone that it is our obligation as faculty members to participate in the Faculty Assembly, and it is especially important that Faculty Senate members attend.

Please also urge that colleagues in your schools to attend. On that note, please remember you serve as representatives of your school so please also report on Senate business to your faculty to keep them up to date and engaged.

Any Other Matters

The report of the Senate Executive Committee to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees at its May meeting will be included with the minutes of this meeting as will the Annual Report of the Senate Executive Committee for the 2013-13 session.

An updated membership list of the Senate Standing Committees will be posted to the Senate website by the middle of next week and published with the minutes of the September meeting. This list will reflect any changes in membership since May, 2013.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is scheduled for September 27, 2013. Resolutions, reports, and any other items of business for the October 11 Senate agenda should be received by the Senate Office before that date.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

The Faculty Senate

September 5, 2013

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, September 13, 2013 at 2:10 p.m. in the State Room, 1957 E Street, N.W., 7th Floor.

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order**
2. **IN MEMORIAM**

 Otto Bergmann, Professor Emeritus of Physics
3. **Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of May 10, 2013 (minutes to be distributed)**
4. **Introduction of newly-elected and re-elected Senate members**
5. **Introduction of new administrative staff and other guests**
6. **Introduction of Resolutions**
7. **Response of the Administration to Senate Resolutions for the 2012-13 Session (The Administrative response is attached)**
8. **Remarks by Nelson A. Carbonell, Jr., Chairman, GW Board of Trustees**
9. **Update on the status of the Lyterati Project (faculty annual reports):
 Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs C. Dianne Martin**
10. **Brief update on changes to the Conflict of Interest Policy requested by the National Institutes of Health
 Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs C. Dianne Martin**
11. **Update on employee fringe benefits consultation and planning for the 2014 Plan Year
 Vice President for Human Resources Sabrina Ellis**

12. GENERAL BUSINESS

- a) Election of faculty members to the following Senate Standing Committees:
Educational Policy: Elias Balaras, Michael Duffey, Elias Carayannis, and Robert W. Rycroft; Physical Facilities: Arlene Pericak; Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom: Michael S. Castleberry, Jennifer Frey, and Kate Malliarakis
- b) Election of faculty members for appointment by the President to Administrative Committees: University Hearing Board: Beverly Westerman
- c) Annual Reports of Senate Committees (Annual Reports of the University and Urban Affairs Committee and the Joint Committee of Faculty & Students are attached)
- d) Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Scheherazade Rehman, Chair
- e) Provost's Remarks
- f) Chair's Remarks

13. Brief Statements (and Questions)

14. Adjournment

Elizabeth A. Amundson

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary



Campbell, Sue <lsbc@email.gwu.edu>

Fwd: State Room Scheduling for 2015-16

1 message

Linda Sue Campbell <lsbc@gwu.edu>

Fri, Sep 5, 2014 at 3:45 PM

Reply-To: lsbc@gwu.edu

To: Barbara Porter <porter@gwu.edu>

Bcc: Linda Sue Campbell <lsbc@gwu.edu>

Barbara:

There is a meeting of the minds on the matter of placing "hold" reservations for the senate and the assembly for five years going forward. I am, of course, relieved and very pleased.

I want to thank you for your efforts in helping to make this happen.

{The email program sure does leave a lot of empty space between messages, doesn't it -- sorry you have to scroll down so much}

Have a great weekend,

Sue

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Linda Sue Campbell** <lsbc@gwu.edu>

Date: Fri, Sep 5, 2014 at 3:37 PM

Subject: Re: State Room Scheduling for 2015-16

To: "Hulse, Samantha" <sshulse@email.gwu.edu>

Cc: Charles Garriss <garriss@gwu.edu>

Dear Samantha:

I'm delighted there is that capacity now and thanks for your prompt follow-up. I will let Academic Affairs know and my chair as well.

Have a very nice weekend,

Sue

On Fri, Sep 5, 2014 at 3:06 PM, Hulse, Samantha <sshulse@email.gwu.edu> wrote:
Sue,

I agree that these structured meetings should be placed on hold for the future, in order to secure the appropriate venues. I will place holds on the State Room and Jack Morton Auditorium for these two meetings for the next five years. Please note that these are only holds, and then one year out we will send

booking confirmations for the venues.

Warm regards,

Samantha Hulse
Assistant Director, Scheduling
Events & Venues, External Relations
The George Washington University
800 21st Street NW, Suite 204
Washington, DC 20052
(p) 202-994-7470
sshulse@gwu.edu
<https://events-venues.gwu.edu/>

On Fri, Sep 5, 2014 at 3:20 PM, Linda Sue Campbell <lsbc@gwu.edu> wrote:

Samantha, this is just great.

Since you asked if there is anything else, in view of the fact that the annual Assembly has a date certain every year -- the first Tuesday in October,

and the Senate meets the second Friday afternoon of each month from September to May, it seems to me that there ought to be a way to institutionalize these reservations just as other University functions are, such as CI, commencement and so forth.

We would be spared going through this annual ritual of uncertainty if a hold could be placed several years ahead, say five, with a confirmation date for the session's meetings to be arranged, perhaps each year in the summertime, one year out..

As the Senate membership increased by 40% in the last year, it is more important than ever that we have certain access on a priority reservation basis for our monthly meetings in the State Room. The capacity of the room and the equipment there are ideal for our meetings. The staff there is very reliable and wonderful to work with (not that the Marvin Center staff are not (!). We do make do with other venues but the acoustics are not as good elsewhere as they are in 1957 E St.. and this is a critical factor for maintaining the official records of the Senate meetings.

I'd appreciate very much if this could be done for future years.

Copying my Chair, Prof. Garris, with whom I have discussed this, and he concurs with this request.

Sue Campbell, Coordinator
Faculty Senate Activities

On Fri, Sep 5, 2014 at 1:31 PM, Hulse, Samantha <sshulse@email.gwu.edu> wrote:

Sue,

Thank you for bringing this to our attention. In order to avoid this complication for next year's meeting, I have gone ahead and put the Jack Morton Auditorium and Art Gallery Lobby on hold all day on Tuesday October 6, 2015.

Please let me know if we can help with anything else.

Warm regards,

Samantha Hulse
Assistant Director, Scheduling
Events & Venues, External Relations
The George Washington University
800 21st Street NW, Suite 204
Washington, DC 20052
(p) 202-994-7470
sshulse@gwu.edu
<https://events-venues.gwu.edu/>

On Fri, Sep 5, 2014 at 1:31 PM, Linda Sue Campbell <lsbc@gwu.edu> wrote:
Samantha and Natalie:

Thanks for the prompt response to this request.

On another topic, the Faculty Assembly is always held on the first Tuesday in October. So I wonder if it is too early to reserve for Fall 2015?

As you all may recall, this is the President's meeting rather than a Senate meeting, and arrangements, including the room reservation, are made by Academic Affairs staff --Ginger Beverly in Vice Provost Martin's Office. Last year when Ginger went to reserve the Morton Auditorium the prescribed year in advance she was told the room was already booked. The result was a frustrating, lengthy and fruitless search for space.

A venue was not booked until August of this year and the location was far from the ideal central campus location that is preferred. Space in the Ballroom and the reception venue was only offered and secured in the last couple of weeks.

Pls. advise on this as I promised to ask about it even though it is not our meeting.

Again, thanks very much.

Sue Campbell, Coordinator
Faculty Senate Activities

On Fri, Sep 5, 2014 at 9:45 AM, Hulse, Samantha <sshulse@email.gwu.edu> wrote:
Sue,

I have gone ahead and placed a hold the State Room for each of the dates listed below. One year prior to the requested date we will send you a confirmation for the meeting.

Please let me know if you have any questions, or need anything else.

Warm regards,

Samantha Hulse
Assistant Director, Scheduling
Events & Venues, External Relations
The George Washington University
800 21st Street NW, Suite 204
Washington, DC 20052
(p) 202-994-7470
sshulse@gwu.edu
<https://events-venues.gwu.edu/>

On Thu, Sep 4, 2014 at 6:48 PM, Natalie Hisczak <nhisczak@gwu.edu> wrote:
Samantha,

Can you please assist Sue with her request.

Thank you.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Linda Sue Campbell** <lsbc@gwu.edu>
Date: Wed, Sep 3, 2014 at 6:16 PM
Subject: State Room Scheduling for 2015-16
To: Natalie Hisczak <nhisczak@gwu.edu>, Michael Peller <mpeller@gwu.edu>
Cc: Charles Garris <garris@gwu.edu>

Dear Natalie:

Earlier today I logged into the events and venues reservation screen to reserve the State Room for our Faculty Senate meetings for next year (the 2015-16 session).

The screen will not allow me to make these reservations as the available date range is from 9-23-14 through 9-3-15 .

So that we can be assured of these reservations for the Senate for next year, this is to request that these reservations be made as soon as possible. They are as follows:

September 11, 2015

October 9, 2015
November 13, 2015
December 11, 2015

January 8, 2016
February 12, 2016
March 11, 2016
April 8, 2016
May 13, 2016

The reservations are from 1:30 p.m. to 5 p.m., with 75 attending.

Thanks for your assistance with this.

cc: Prof. Charles Garriss, Executive Committee Chair